25

26

27

28

1

2 3 4 5 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 SAN JOSE DIVISION 10 Intel Corp., NO. C 08-04555 JW NO. C 08-05543 JW 11 NO. C 08-05544 JW Broadcom Corp., et al., NO. C 08-05624 SI 12 NO. C 08-05742 MHP Marvell Semiconductor, Inc., et al., 13 ORDER RELATING CASES; STAYING CASE DEADLINES; SETTING CASE 14 MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE; DENYING MOTION TO EXTEND TIME Acer America Corp., et al., 15 16 Sony Computer Entertainment America, Inc., et al., 17 Plaintiffs, 18 v. 19 Wi-LAN, Inc., et al., 20 Defendants. 21 22 **Motions to Relate Cases** Presently before the Court are two administrative motions to relate this action, Intel Corp. v. 23

Wi-LAN, Inc., No. C 08-04555 JW to two later-filed cases in this District, Sony Computer

Entertainment America, Inc. v. Wi-LAN, Inc., No. C 08-05742 MHP, and Acer America Corp v.

Wi-LAN, Inc., No. C 08-05624 SI. (Docket Item Nos. 41, 43.) On January 16, 2009, the Court related this action to two additional later-filed cases, Broadcom Corp. v. Wi-LAN, Inc., No. C 08-05543 JW, and Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. v. Wi-LAN, Inc., No. C 08-05544 JW. (See Docket

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Item No. 38.) Defendants have filed a statement of non-opposition to Plaintiffs' motions to relate. (Docket Item No. 49.)

Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) provides that an action is related to another when:

- (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and
- (2) It appears that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different judges.

Upon review, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have made a sufficient showing to establish that each of the later-filed cases are substantially related to the <u>Intel</u> action under Local Rule 3-12(a). Since <u>Intel</u> is the first-filed action, the cases are properly related to the <u>Intel</u> action. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' motions to relate.

В. **Case Scheduling**

The Court has now related the Intel action to four other declaratory judgment actions pending in this District. The Court has also been informed that the patent at issue in the five cases in this District, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,749 ("'749 patent"), is being asserted by Defendants against Plaintiffs in an infringement action in the Eastern District of Texas, known as Wi-LAN, Inc. v. Acer, No. 2:07-CV-473 (TJW) (E.D. Tex.). Relatedly, Defendants in the <u>Broadcom</u> action have moved to either dismiss or transfer the case to the Eastern District of Texas.

In light of the growing complexity of these related actions, the Court orders as follows:

- (1) All parties shall appears for the Case Management Conference currently set for March 16, 2009 at 10 a.m. At the Conference, the Court intends to address case consolidation and a global approach for managing Defendants' motions to dismiss these actions or to transfer them to the Eastern District of Texas. With these issues in mind, on or before March 6, 2009, the parties to all five cases shall collectively file a Joint Case Management Statement.
- (2) All deadlines in the five related Wi-LAN actions are STAYED.
- (3) Defendant Intel's Motion to Dismiss for lack of jurisdiction (Docket Item No. 31) presently set for March 30, 2009 is taken off calendar until such time as the Court

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

1		determines the case structu	ure following	g the March 16, 2009 Case Management
2		Conference.		
3	(4)	Defendants' Motion to Extend Time in the <u>Broadcom</u> action (Docket Item No. 1		
4		Case No. C 08-05543 JW)	is DENIED	as moot.
5				\circ ι
6	Dated: Febru	ary 20, 2009		James Wase
7				United States District Judge
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				

(Docket Item No. 11 in

28

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO: 1 A. James Isbester jamie@itpatentcounsel.com Adam R. Alper aalper@kirkland.com Christian Chadd Taylor ctaylor@kirkland.com 3 Gayle Esther Rosenstein gayle.rosenstein@weil.com George C. Best gbest@foley.com Gregory S. Arovas garovas@kirkland.com 4 5 John M. Desmarais jdesmarais@kirkland.com Megan M Chung mmchung@townsend.com Michael C. Spillner mspillner@orrick.com 6 Michael Woodrow De Vries mike.devries@lw.com 7 8 Dated: February 20, 2009 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk 9 10 /s/ JW Chambers **By:**_ Elizabeth Garcia 11 **Courtroom Deputy** 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27